

Section 1: The Transliminal Ontologic as the Question

Introduction

The concept of The Transliminal Ontologic introduces a unique approach to understanding the fundamental nature of questioning itself. This methodology embraces the existential dimensions of inquiry, seeking to engage deeply with the phenomenon of questioning to transcend traditional frameworks of closure, definition, and singularity. By examining the interplay between the expectation of closure, the role of the questioner, and the relational dynamics inherent in questioning, The Transliminal Ontologic reveals an existential approach to knowledge and being.

1.1. The Expectation of Closure

When a question is posed, an expectation emerges—that there must be an answer. An answer presupposes that the question was formulated with the intent to be concluded, brought to closure. A question structured with an inherent expectation of closure inevitably raises the notion of "closedness" to the forefront of inquiry. Consequently, the hermeneutic circle that engages with such a question is oriented toward establishing "the final answer," "the only answer," or simply "The Answer."

What, then, fundamentally calls within such an enclosure, where each phenomenon engaged expresses "the way towards an ending" or "the pathway to closure"? What is it that calls forth most essentially in this

manner? What is it that demands a response, or more significantly, insists upon its own response?

Questions with the expectation of closure are not merely epistemic tools; they are ontological orientations that fundamentally shape the modes of inquiry. The demand for an answer introduces a particular relational dynamic between the questioner and the phenomenon in question. It implies a conclusion, an end-state, which casts a shadow over the process of inquiry. This shadow is not merely metaphorical but informs the entire structure of inquiry.

The hermeneutic framing, therefore, is imbued with an implicit closure that limits the very nature of what is sought. It is in this limitation that the being of the question becomes enmeshed with the being of closedness, marking the phenomenon as inherently bound by its own anticipatory horizon.

In examining the nature of closure, we must also confront the notion that every closure presupposes a boundary—a line that demarcates what is "within" from what is "outside" concerning what the closure is "about." The being of closedness thereby carries an implicit spatiality, where the notions of "inside" and "outside" define the limits of what is conceivable within the question in terms of what the question contains or carries.

These spatial metaphors are not merely abstract but reveal the ontological stakes of inquiry—the way in which inquiry expresses the way of being. They articulate how questioning itself manifests the boundaries of thought,

shaping the ways in which phenomena can come to mean what they can, by being "about" what is "within" and raising what is "without." In engaging with these boundaries, the questioner inherently positions themselves within an enclosed framework—one that both enables and restricts the possibilities of engagement.

1.2. The Call for a Singular Response

What kind of phenomenon calls out for a response that is "a single answer"? The style of inquiry we are concerned with here calls for a single response to a phenomenon. In asking what the phenomenon is that calls for a single phenomenon (phenomenon as "response"), is not our question equally calling for a single phenomenon?

Thus, does a question that calls for the kind of question it itself is—that is, does our question—take on a privileged status in answering the question of the nature of this phenomenon precisely because it is the very same phenomenon we are investigating? Does not the question that leads this inquiry call forward a reflexive stance with itself—reflexive in seeking to determine whether the question itself can comprehend itself?

Our inquiry, as a phenomenon, reflects upon itself in answering this question about itself. That is, this question, raised as a phenomenon, must encounter itself as alienated from itself, as if of a different nature, to resolve itself as the question it itself questions. In other words, the question that calls is reflected upon by the same question that responds.

Thus, we are presented with:

The aspects of phenomena in general as multidimensional.

The transliminality of being in general.

Further, if such a question can comprehend itself as a style of question, does this not call us toward the possibility that any question at all can come to understand itself? Assuming a question can reflect upon itself, if any question can come to "understand" itself, then what kind of phenomenon is a question? More specifically, what kind of phenomenon is a question in that it might engage existentially, i.e., as understanding—assuming that "to understand" is existential?

Returning to the ontological ground of questioning: if we hold the "Question" within an existential horizon, does it not inherently call forward, at the very least, insights about the response—the attuned orientation—that leads back to the principal matter of concern we have raised? Is the inquiry we engage here a circular inquiry? If it is circular and can be answered, then what do both the question and the answer mean?

Does it mean that the Question itself demonstrates the meaning of meaning by being that which, in order to grasp its ontological character, requires us to accept a circularity of reasoning? Does that indicate that meaning is given by a structural enclosure?

The call for a singular response speaks to an existential desire for certainty. It seeks to reduce multiplicity to unity, ambiguity to clarity, and uncertainty to definitiveness. In doing so, it reveals a fundamental existential attunement—a mode of being uncomfortable with openness and seeking finality.

The existential horizon within which "The Question" resides is itself characterized by an anticipatory structure that points toward closure. This anticipatory structure is ontological, indicating a being-towards-conclusion that defines the very character of questioning. The demand for singularity is not neutral; it reflects an ontological condition of wanting-to-know in a manner that resists the plurality and fluidity inherent in being.

To question the legitimacy of a singular answer is to call into question the nature of the questioning being itself. If we interrogate whether a question can ultimately understand itself, we encounter the limits of reflexivity—where a question turns upon itself, seeking its own ground of possibility. Reflexive questioning disrupts the linearity of seeking and finding; it is an act of folding inquiry upon itself, revealing the contingencies and presuppositions that shape its trajectory.

In this reflexive movement, the inquiry into the question's capacity for self-comprehension becomes an inquiry into the nature of questioning as such. This circularity, rather than being a defect, is a mark of the existential

condition of the questioner, who is always already implicated in the process of questioning.

Section 1.3: The Being of Closedness

When a question presupposes a singular response, it centers on the necessity of bringing the matter of concern to closure. If the question itself embodies a desire for closure, we are invoking a phenomenon that calls our being toward the "being of closedness." When we engage with each phenomenon by attuning ourselves to the call of the being to which it belongs—as required for an ontologically grounded and liminally oriented inquiry—we align ourselves with the being of closedness. From the perspective of Dasein (a term used by Heidegger to denote human existence or "being-there"), we must consider how we enact or embody closure, especially when variable components complicate the situation we aim to enclose.

The being of closedness is an existential mode that defines how Dasein relates to the world. Closure implies a finality that contrasts with the open-ended nature of existential becoming, yet it is also a necessary aspect of understanding. In each engagement, there is an implicit orientation toward some form of conclusion—whether an answer, a decision, or a resolution. This attunement toward closure shapes not only the outcome of inquiry but also the manner in which the inquiry unfolds. It represents a temporal

orientation that seeks to stabilize what is inherently unstable, to bring rest to what is in motion.

However, this drive for closure reveals something profound about the nature of Dasein. It is not merely a cognitive impulse but an ontological one—a striving to make sense of the world by delimiting it and defining its contours. In doing so, Dasein exhibits its fundamental nature as a being that is both finite and situated. The desire for closure expresses the finitude of Dasein—a recognition that our time is limited and that understanding must, therefore, reach some form of conclusion. Yet this conclusion is never absolute; it remains provisional and open to reinterpretation and renewed engagement.

Section 1.4: Attunement Toward the Undisclosed

Every question naturally tunes us toward aspects that are not yet revealed. The very essence of questioning involves an attunement toward the undisclosed nature of being. Therefore, if the form of the question—assuming it is specific rather than general—focuses on closure, then the being of this phenomenon is not entirely undisclosed, except insofar as the undisclosed is contained within it. As a being characterized by closedness while simultaneously oriented toward the undisclosed, it reveals itself as already possessing a definite shape. This constitutes the "expectation" within its experience: in the way it calls, it operates within a spatial domain—definite in form and shape. Consequently, a shadow is pre-cast by a

question that anticipates an answer. And if there is a shadow, there must be something that obstructs the light.

This attunement toward the undisclosed points to an existential openness at the heart of phenomenological inquiry. Engaging with the undisclosed is entering a relationship with what cannot yet be fully articulated or known. It involves a readiness to be surprised, challenged, and transformed by what we encounter. The shadow pre-cast by expectation indicates the presence of something yet to be revealed—both a limit and an invitation to further exploration.

Section 1.5: The Pre-Cast Shadow of Expectation

When we pose a question expecting a singular answer, we experience a "shadow" cast by the obstacle that blocks full understanding. This shadow symbolizes the limits imposed by our expectations. The challenge lies in comprehending the nature of this shadow—the structure of our expectations. Is this structure, this experience of limitation, itself the focus of our concern? For those to whom such a question is posed, the shadow becomes the central issue.

However, when the question turns upon itself and we attempt to define precisely what casts the shadow, who is to respond if not the entity that casts it? We might assume that there is a call within this phenomenon insisting on a singular response. Demanding a singular answer from that which insists upon a response suggests we have already received our

answer: it insists upon one response. This seems redundant and paradoxical.

By turning the question upon itself and adopting an ontological-existential perspective, we recognize that the insistence upon a response belongs to the being posing the question—ourselves. When we acknowledge that our own being stands in the way and casts the shadow, we reorient our inquiry, opening a path toward deeper understanding.

Section 1.6: The Ontological Attunement to Disclosure

Therefore, attunement toward the undisclosed—which anticipates closure—is, in an ontological-existential sense, an attunement toward the undisclosed that prefigures its own revelation. It is an attunement toward a mode of being. The shadow cast by expectation is maintained by the being whose essence is to engage with the being of beings, responding to the call of Being itself.

Being calls forth the being of entities through disclosure, for us as beings. Being is always a question for us, and in our questioning, we exist within and as Being. Our ontological constitution can thus be framed as an existential liminality—a condition of being on the threshold—that is transcendental. We always belong to what we are estranged from, reasserting our place within Being precisely through that estrangement. This is what we refer to as the transliminal being of Being.

Section 1.7: The Question as the Call of Being

Every question is ultimately the call of Being itself. Since any question that expects a singular answer expresses Being's call, it follows that every question inherently anticipates one answer. Should any question—indeed, any question whatsoever—be considered problematic because of this expectation?

Historically, two perspectives have emerged: one argues that expecting a single answer is inherently limiting and problematic, while the other maintains that a singular answer is both necessary and inevitable. Is not the historical situatedness of the transliminal being of Being—the human condition of existing within and beyond thresholds—the primary matter upon which this issue hinges?

Being calls to us, and we respond with a singular answer provided by a being whose structure is individual and finite—bounded by aspects such as birth and death or body and mind—each instance colored by its own unique way of being. Therefore, it is not the unidirectional nature of the transliminal being that should raise concern regarding the nature of questioning. Rather, the concern lies in the historical and situational context of the transliminal being of Being.

Section 1.8: The Genealogical Relationality of the Transliminal Being

The situational character of the transliminal being is imbued with genealogical relationality—the interconnectedness of phenomena through a lineage of calls and responses. Every call is an expression that both

advances and extends phenomena. Each phenomenon has a call that propels it forward, and in doing so, it furthers the very phenomenon that initiated it.

For example, consider how a question leads to an answer, which in turn prompts further questions. This ongoing chain reflects genealogical relationality, where each element is related to others through a dynamic process of unfolding and becoming. The transliminal being exists within this web of relations, attuned to the calls that shape its being.

Section 1.9: Temporality and Proximal Attunement

Since every phenomenon simultaneously calls forward and furthers itself, all phenomena are inherently relational. Each reveals its meaning through the act of calling, as an attunement toward the beings of Being. In this dual role of calling and responding, the temporality of the transliminal being is situational, manifesting through relationships of proximity. This proximity is characterized by a general attunement—the way in which "this speaks on behalf of that" within the general mode of being, oriented toward Being itself.

Therefore, the genealogical relationality of every phenomenon is shaped by this proximal attunement toward Being. Because every call is both a calling forward and a further calling, each call resonates within other calls, attuning all toward the very Being of Being itself. In other words, every phenomenon embraces the phenomena to which it is genealogically related, according to their proximity to the call of Being. Furthermore, each

phenomenon contains within itself the temporal structure of the way for the transliminal being to be.

Section 2. Phenomenological Genealogy

2.1. The Nature of Inquiry as Calling

Every inquiry originates as a calling. When we ask a question like “What is a shoe?”, the inquiry operates in two capacities: (1) as an enclosure that invites response and (2) as a matter of concern that emerges from within and is intrinsically part of this enclosure. The call itself is both the impetus for the concern raised within the inquiry and an expression of an open enclosure seeking response.

This open enclosure is the question in its articulated form—“What is a shoe?”—and it is distinct from the specific matter it reveals. The question does not derive its character from the content it raises. Instead, the matter of concern emerges from within the call, sharing the essential character of the call itself. Here, we observe the first glimpse of our methodological approach: the genealogical relationship between the call and its own unfolding. This genealogical unfolding is not merely linear but recursive, where each iteration reenacts the original impetus of the call, creating a layered structure of understanding that evolves and deepens with each engagement.

2.2. Transcendental Genealogy and Reflexivity

This indicates that we are employing a genealogical method of analysis. Unlike biological genealogies that focus on direct connections through genetic markers,

this genealogical relationship is transcendental—it goes beyond empirical lineage to explore the conditions of possibility for phenomena.

In this context, the phenomena under inquiry are co-equally expressions of the phenomenon itself. The call as parent and the call as progeny reveal a fundamental, self-unfolding movement: the call steps forth, revealing itself in a dual aspect, with each aspect surpassing into the other and then turning back upon itself, differentiated yet fundamentally unified.

This dynamic of surpassing and differentiation allows the phenomenon to be itself for itself. The transcendental genealogy requires us to consider the nature of temporality within the inquiry, as each moment of surpassing brings with it an unfolding of time where the original impetus of the call is retained yet evolves.

The reflexivity here is crucial because it establishes an ontological continuity between the initial call and its successive manifestations. Each iteration reveals more about the initial inquiry, illuminating its depth and potentialities. The genealogy is not merely tracing origins but rearticulating being as unfolding, surpassing, and returning.

2.3. The Primacy of the Question

The question, as a phenomenon, steps forward and centers itself in the inquiry by raising the call—“a shoe.” However, the primacy remains with the question itself as the locus of the inquiry. The question becomes a modal vessel through which we attune ourselves to the phenomena of the world—including “a shoe.”

This attunement is active, drawing us into a mode of inquiry by opening a space that demands disclosure—a call that necessitates our response. The centering of

the question establishes an orientation—a way of relating to phenomena that configures them within a particular mode of being. It invites us to perceive phenomena as part of a broader ontological horizon, deepening our engagement.

By establishing itself as the primary focus, the question compels us to recognize the limitations and possibilities inherent in the act of inquiry. Our engagement with phenomena is always informed by the situatedness of the questioner, whose historical, existential, and relational contexts shape the attunement to the phenomena. This interplay forms the basis of an ontological triangulation underlying the act of inquiry.

2.4. Ontological Clearing and Relational Engagement

The question, as an enclosing modality, establishes a space for what is yet to come. It draws us into a relational engagement, creating an ontological clearing where meaning begins to coalesce. In this space, phenomena are enclosed within the horizon of the question.

The subject of inquiry—“a shoe”—is not immediately thrust into the foreground as an object. Instead, the question's inherent nature shapes how the phenomena will be encountered. The question signifies that there is something present requiring engagement, whose meaning must be elicited through deliberate investigation.

This ontological clearing is where being and meaning intersect. It is both an opening and a boundary—a place where phenomena can emerge while being shaped by the limits of the inquiry. Within this space, the potential of inquiry is realized, as phenomena are allowed to emerge fully while situated within a defining context.

2.5. Layers of the Call and Open-Ended Inquiry

This constitutes the initial layer of the call—the way the question envelops and situates phenomena within the context of inquiry. The question does not merely point to “a shoe” as an object; it attunes us to the necessity of undertaking an inquiry—a relational engagement with phenomena.

The question centers the process of inquiry, not the object itself. The modality of the call immerses us in the act of questioning rather than prematurely focusing on content. This immersion is essential in phenomenological genealogy, ensuring the inquiry remains open-ended and allows for the continual unfolding of meaning.

The layering of the call becomes a methodological tool to navigate the complexities of phenomena without reducing them to simplistic definitions. Each layer reveals different aspects, adding depth and allowing us to perceive interconnected elements within the inquiry. This layered approach highlights the dynamic nature of phenomenological genealogy, where each stage builds upon the previous, creating a cumulative understanding that is both recursive and expansive.

2.6. The Subject as Ontological Phenomenon

The matter of concern that emerges within the call, articulated through the question, is traditionally referred to as the “subject.” However, in phenomenological inquiry, the term “subject” transcends grammatical connotations. The question presents “a shoe” not merely as a linguistic or grammatical object but as a phenomenon emerging within the horizon created by the question.

Here, the subject is not just a linguistic construct but a phenomenon to be engaged in its ontological essence. This approach moves beyond grammatical analysis toward the onto-phenomenological. What demands our response is not simply a word but a phenomenon requiring engagement in its full ontological depth.

2.7. Encountering the Phenomenon in the World

When we pose the question, “What is a shoe?”, we are not primarily concerned with syntax or linguistic structures. Our purpose is to encounter the shoe as a phenomenon existing in the world. Within this inquiry, “a shoe” transcends its status as an arbitrary term; it becomes an expression of our relational engagement with the world of phenomena.

The shoe, as a being, comes forth within the framework of inquiry as something to be disclosed, inhabiting our shared world of experience. This shared world is crucial, as the shoe is part of a larger experiential context that includes both the inquirer and the environment. The question brings forth this world of relations, highlighting the interconnectedness of all phenomena.

2.8. The Call as Ontological Opening

The call functions both as the modality of inquiry and as the ontological opening through which the phenomenon can be disclosed. It attunes us not only to the specific subject but also to the conditions making this engagement possible. It invites us into a mode of being where phenomena like “a shoe” reveal themselves not as isolated objects but as relational entities woven into the fabric of experience.

Inquiry transcends mere semantics or grammatical analysis; it becomes an existential engagement with the being of the phenomenon itself. The ontological opening created by the call is an invitation to encounter the phenomenon in its entirety, requiring a shift in perspective toward the ways in which the phenomenon is embedded in the world.

2.9. Bringing Forth Phenomena Through Engagement

Through the call, phenomena are brought forth, emerging from the background into the relational space where they may be encountered. The question is more than a tool; it is a dynamic act disclosing the phenomenon by calling for a response. It creates an opening where the phenomenon is ready to be encountered, understood, and integrated into our experience.

This act of bringing forth is active engagement requiring the inquirer to participate fully in the unfolding of the phenomenon. The inquiry is never static; it evolves as each encounter brings new insights and layers of meaning, contributing to the overall understanding.

2.10. Relational Encounter and Dialogical Engagement

When we ask, “What is a shoe?”, we engage in a relational encounter—a dialogical engagement where the being of the shoe is disclosed not merely as an object to be labeled but as a being whose meaning emerges within the context of inquiry. This engagement is characterized by mutuality, where both the inquirer and the phenomenon are transformed through the process.

Meaning is not pre-given but emerges through the interaction between the questioner and the phenomenon. The shoe is not a static entity; its meaning

unfolds as new aspects are revealed and relations established. The question serves as the catalyst for this unfolding, enabling the phenomenon to disclose itself in its full complexity.

2.11. The Ontological Ground of Inquiry

To inquire, to call forth a question, is to enter this relational mode of engagement. It opens a pathway toward the phenomenon's disclosure and positions us within the world of beings—not merely as subjects but as ones called upon to respond. The call of the question provides the ontological foundation upon which the entire methodology rests, where the being of phenomena steps forth to be encountered and articulated in its essence.

This foundational aspect highlights the existential nature of inquiry—not just an intellectual exercise but a mode of being involving the whole person, engaging with the world meaningfully and transformatively. The phenomenological genealogy is not merely a method; it is an existential orientation fundamentally attuned to the relational and dynamic nature of existence.